



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

was favorably received by his countrymen, who rejoiced in so signal a vengeance, and was incorporated in the legend of his life.

I still believe that the Sampson legend is a genuine tradition of fact, though not unmingled with the alloy of exaggeration and rumor with which all tradition is combined. Sampson was an actual Jewish Shophet, and not an imaginary Chaldean god.

GEO. W. SHAW.

DR. PFLEIDERER ON THE SAMSON STORY.

(A Translation.)

To the Editor of The Monist:

I have read with great interest your essay on the Samson myth in the January number of *The Monist*, and agree with you on all essential points, especially when you find in Samson and analogous heroes in whom an incarnated god fights, strives and conquers, a typical ideal which has received its most excellent fulfilment in the Christian faith. The question whether any particular myth has its origin here and there in historical legends, or whether the legends have grown out of the myth without any historical foundation, you leave undecided. I too think that it is not to be answered *a priori* and universally but only in each concrete case under exact investigation of the tradition. But for the Samson myth I would consider a historical foundation as improbable as for that of Heracles and Izdubar. The localization of mythical features may be followed up in every case and is closely connected with the different places of worship at which the myth becomes realized in the ritual drama. Your observation is excellent that the Easter ritual of the Greek Church is formed after the dramatic representation of the Attis and Tammuz festival (page 74). But why is this said to have taken place only since the time of Constantine? Should not rather our Gospel Easter story have found its most simple explanation in the imitation of the Syrian Easter festival? I have pointed this out in my last two books (*Entstehung des Christentums* and *Religion und Religionen*) and in my opinion it deserves serious consideration. Then also the parallel of the Evangelical Passion story with the *Spottkönig* of the Saceans and Saturnalians must not be overlooked. If one will but consider that from the beginning the death and resurrection of the God-man has been the main content of the Christian faith which alone was recognized by Paul and which Mark

considered of first importance, then the question of the historicity of this content becomes clear and constantly more important. I would like very much to learn your opinion about the hypotheses of Benjamin W. Smith (*Der vorchristliche Jesus*) and Thomas Whittaker (*Origins of Christianity*). It would be serviceable if you would bring these radical theories into contrast with my comparatively conservative view, and would instruct your public about this crisis at the very beginning of primitive Christianity.

DR. OTTO PFLEIDERER.

GROSSLICHTERFELDE, GERMANY.

THE LOGICAL ASPECT OF THE THEORY OF HYPER-SPACES.

A study of the articles on hyper-spaces by Cassius J. Keyser in *The Monist* for January 1906 and by W. B. Pitkin in the January number this year seems to me to reveal pretty clearly an error into which certain mathematicians have fallen in the consideration of this subject. But the curious thing in Mr. Pitkin's article is, that, although he is sufficiently aware of the error to perceive it in others, he partly falls into it himself in pointing it out in them. In short, he only partly perceives the error.

The error is in trying to generalize the idea of dimensionality. The truth is that dimensionality is a property peculiar to space. Dimensions determine space and other properties determine other things. But, as Mr. Pitkin says, while the dimensions of space are determinants, the determinants of things other than space cannot be called dimensions.

But the proof of this fact depends, I think, on differences more thorough and radical than Mr. Pitkin is aware of.

The striking peculiarity of the dimensions of space which distinguishes them from the determinants of sound or color or anything else, is the fact that they are all identically the same in kind. For convenience in conversation we refer to them as length, breadth, and height. But, as regards the determination of a given space, it is of absolutely no importance which dimension we term length, which breadth, and which height. A striking result of this peculiarity is that any two or all three of these dimensions may be multiplied together and an intelligible result produced thereby. The fact is that the dimensions of space are themselves space-forms of space.